

INVASION!

Guyana's Principled Position on the Invasion of the
Sovereign State of GRENADA

64753Pg

25

CONTENTS

	Page
Introductory Note	5
1. GRENADA AT A GLANCE	7
(a) Facts and Figures, Dates in History	7
(b) Notes on the New Jewel Movement and the People's Revolutionary Government	9
(c) Some Achievements of the People's Revolutionary Government	10
2. GUYANA - GRENADA RELATIONS	13
A Brief describing Guyana's relationship with the People's Revolutionary Government and New Jewel Movement	13
3. THE OCTOBER 1983 CRISIS	15
(a) "No Consensus on Issues"	18
(b) Two Statements by President Forbes Burnham	22
(c) GUYANA'S PRINCIPLED POSITION ON THE INVASION OF THE SOVEREIGN STATE OF GRENADA.	26
5. THE INVASION AND OCCUPATION: GUYANA REACTS	29
(a) Reactions from Guyana: Guyana's Ambassador to the U.N. Cde. Noel Sinclair's Statement. Foreign Minister Rashleigh Jackson in the National Assembly (Excerpts).	29 - 32
(b) Statement by the Central Executive Committee of the P.N.C.	35
(c) Joint Resolution in the Security Council	36
(d) Resolution Passed at Mass Rally	38
(e) Statement by the Guyana T.U.C.	40
6. THE (DIS) INFORMATION STRATEGY:	43
Three (3) pieces that indicate how the United States and certain regional media agencies controlled, slanted and distorted information about the Invasion	43

CONTENTS

	Page
Introductory Note	5
1. GRENADA AT A GLANCE	7
(a) Facts and Figures, Dates in History	7
(b) Notes on the New Jewel Movement and the People's Revolutionary Government.	9
(c) Some Achievements of the People's Revolutionary Government	10
2. GUYANA – GRENADA RELATIONS	13
A Brief describing Guyana's relationship with the People's Revolutionary Government and New Jewel Movement	13
3. THE OCTOBER 1983 CRISIS	15
A Chronology-of-Events type of sequence tracing the beginning and development of the Grenada Crisis.	15
4. THE SELL-OUT	18
(a) Two articles by Editor-in-Chief Courtney Gibson: "Grenada and Caricom: The Folly and the Tragedy", "No Consensus on Key Issues."	18
(b) Two Statements by President Forbes Burnham.	22
(c) The President Elaborates – Excerpts from A Press Conference hosted by President Burnham.	26
5. THE INVASION AND OCCUPATION: GUYANA REACTS	29
(a) Reactions from Guyana: Guyana's Ambassador to the U.N. Cde. Noel Sinclair's Statement. Foreign Minister Rashleigh Jackson in the National Assembly (Excerpts).	29 – 32
(b) Statement by the Central Executive Committee of the P.N.C.	35
(c) Joint Resolution in the Security Council	36
(d) Resolution Passed at Mass Rally	38
(e) Statement by the Guyana T.U.C.	40
6. THE (DIS) INFORMATION STRATEGY:	43
Three (3) pieces that indicate how the United States and certain regional media agencies controlled, slanted and distorted information about the Invasion:	43

	(a) The Regional Media and the Grenada Tragedy — A Viewpoint by Allan Fenty.	43
Page	(b) Protests Continue Over Press Restriction, Misleading Information — A Press Report from the Associated Press.	44
2	(c) An Off-the-Record War-Article taken from Newsweek magazine, November 7, 1983.	45
7		
7		
9		
10		
13		
13		
12		
12		
18		
18		
22		
26		
29		
29 - 32		
32		
36		
38		
40		
43		
43		

GRENADA AT A GLANCE

STATUS:	Independent State within the Commonwealth of Nations. Became independent February 7, 1974.
CAPITAL:	St. George's.
LOCATION:	Grenada is the southern-most of the Windward Islands of the Eastern Caribbean. It is located some 100 miles from Barbados, 90 miles from Trinidad and 68 miles from St. Vincent.
SIZE:	344 sq. miles.

INTRODUCTORY NOTE

This publication is comprised of a small collection of articles statements and resolutions which all indicate Guyana's principled position on the United States-led invasion of sovereign CARICOM member-state Grenada in October of 1983.

Readers are introduced to Grenada in the first biographical piece. There then follows a selection of statements and speeches, reports and resolutions which express Guyana's rejection of the interference in the internal affairs of a small sovereign State by a mighty, heavily-armed Super-Power.

As Guyana's President Forbes Burnham observed: "... here we have a case of the re-introduction of colonialism and imperialism by invitation . . . in the Caribbean. We have a group, most members of which are members of the Non-Aligned Movement, which has as one of its principles, "the Non-Interference in the Internal Affairs of Sovereign States."

"The whole thing is contrary to International Law and the Charter of the United Nations as well as the Declaration of the Inadmissibility of Intervention and Interference in the Internal Affairs of States subscribed to and supported by all CARICOM countries who were members of the United Nations when it was agreed to by the General Assembly of the United Nations in December 1981."

From the biographical "Glance" at Grenada to the Resolutions demanding the withdrawal of the American invasion forces from Grenada, this slim publication presents how the leadership and nation of Guyana felt, and still feel, about this latest blatant act of aggression against a people's sovereignty.

LANGUAGE:	English
ETHNIC GROUP:	Black, East Indian (3%), White.
RELIGIONS:	Predominantly Roman Catholic, Anglican, Methodist, Seventh-Day Adventist.
OTHER TOWNS:	Gouyave, Grenville, Victoria, Sautours.

Editor
Publications Unit
Ministry of Information
Brickdam, Georgetown
March, 1984.

DATES IN GRENADA'S HISTORY

1498	Discovered by Columbus.
1609	First settlement (English) attempted - ejected by Carib Indians.
1626/7	Both FRANCE and ENGLAND claimed title.

GRENADA AT A GLANCE

STATUS:	Independent State within the Commonwealth of Nations. Became independent February 7, 1974.
CAPITAL:	St. George's.
LOCATION:	Grenada is the southern-most of the Windward Islands of the Eastern Caribbean. It is located some 100 miles from Barbados, 90 miles from Trinidad and 68 miles from St. Vincent.
SIZE:	344 km ² (133 square miles).
POPULATION:	106,267 (1981 mid-year estimate).
POPULATION DENSITY:	309 persons per km ² .
MAJOR PRODUCTS:	Bananas, nutmegs, cocoa, mace.
CURRENCY:	The Eastern Caribbean Dollar.
GOVERNMENT:	Grenada is an Independent State, a member of the United Nations, the Non-Aligned Movement, the Commonwealth of Nations and the Organisation of American States. Grenada became a member of CARICOM on May 1, 1974. At that time, Eric Gairy who led Grenada from 1952 to 1979, was the Head of Government (During the period 1957 to 1967 Herbert Blaize's Grenada National Party was in power). Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II is represented by a Governor-General. A popular people's government was formed on March 13, 1979. In October of 1983 internal dissension within the People's Revolutionary Government led to the death of the Prime Minister, Maurice Bishop, and the subsequent invasion of the island by United States forces assisted by Caribbean forces from the O.E.C.S. and Barbados and Jamaica.
LANGUAGE:	English
ETHNIC GROUP:	Black (84%) Mixed (11%), East Indian (3%) White.
RELIGIONS:	Predominantly Roman Catholic; Anglican, Methodist, Seventh-Day Adventist.
OTHER TOWNS:	Gouyave, Grenville, Victoria, Sauteurs.

DATES IN GRENADA'S HISTORY

- 1498 Discovered by Columbus.
- 1609 First settlement (English) attempted — ejected by Carib Indians.
- 1626/7 Both FRANCE and ENGLAND claimed title.

1638	First French settlement attempted — fought off by Caribs.	
1650	Island bought by Frenchman (du Parquet) and settlement established.	STATUS:
1651	Caribs defeated by French, culminating in "Caribs Leap" at Sauteurs.	
1664	French West India Company took over island.	CAPITAL:
1674	French Colony.	LOCATION:
1700	First census: 257 whites; 525 slaves; 53 free coloureds.	
1763	Island ceded to Britain (Anglo-French 7 years war).	SIZE:
1779	Captured by French.	POPULATION:
1783	Restored to Britain under Treaty of Versailles.	POPULATION DENSITY:
1795	Revolt of French residents under Fedon failed.	MAJOR PRODUCTS:
1838	Slaves freed.	CURRENCY:
1843	Nutmeg cultivation introduced.	GOVERNMENT:
1857	First East Indian Immigrants.	
1871	Telegraph connected.	
1943	Pearl's Airport opened.	
1955	Hurricane Janet devastated the Caribbean, including Grenada.	
1958	West Indies Federation.	
1962	Dissolution of West Indies Federation.	
1967	Associated Statehood with Britain.	
1974	Independence from Britain achieved. Grenada remains a monarchy within the Commonwealth.	LANGUAGE:
1979	March 13 — People's Revolution — People's Revolutionary Government installed.	ETHNIC GROUP:
1983	October — PRG collapse. Invasion by U.S. Army. Occupation and installation of an "Interim Administration".	RELIGION:

OTHER TOWNS: Gouyave, Grenville, Victor's, Sauteurs.

DATES IN GRENADA'S HISTORY

1498	Discovered by Columbus.
1609	First settlement (English) attempted — ejected by Carib Indians.
1626/7	Both FRANCE and ENGLAND claimed title.

FROM THE NEW JEWEL MOVEMENT (NJM)
TO THE PEOPLE'S REVOLUTIONARY GOVERNMENT (PRG)

Early in the nineteen-fifties Eric Gairy enjoyed the support of the Grenadian people. He won the first general elections and obtained the mandate to work for the improvement of his people. It might be said that after a promising start, Gairy succumbed to the varied temptations of power and greed. Forgetting the masses, he joined those who formerly exploited the people and became even more corrupt, eccentric and repressive.

By the early nineteen-seventies popular opposition to Eric Gairy assumed organised proportions.

In March 1972 an opposition organisation called JEWEL was formed. "JEWEL" is the acronym for Joint Endeavour for Welfare, Education and Liberation (of the People). This group was based in the south-eastern (parish of St. David) of Grenada. Teachers, peasants, youths had all been mobilised. They had established an Agricultural Co-operative Society and had even begun to publish an informational News Sheet.

Six months later, in September of 1972, another grouping, based in the capital parish of St. George's, was born. That organisation was the Movement for the Assemblies of the People (MAP) and it was composed of a mixture of professional types — lawyers, teachers — as well as other workers and youths. To quote Bernard Coard, former Deputy Prime Minister of the deposed PRG Government of Grenada: "What they all had in common was that they were young; they had come out of a Black Power tradition of the late 1960's and early 1970's. Many had lived in Britain, Canada and the U.S.A. and had studied and worked in those countries. They were all linked with young people struggling for similar broad goals, objectives and ideals in the neighbouring islands. Many were influenced by the 1970 uprising in Trinidad. All were deeply committed to the development of the country".

So it was that these two organisations quickly identified themselves as one, and after massive joint Congresses and Conventions of the People one year after the formation of JEWEL, the two groups formally merged in 1973 to become one body known as THE NEW JEWEL MOVEMENT.

Between 1973 and 1974 opposition to the Gairy administration, led by the NJM, intensified. Gairy had won the 1972 elections and had set about entrenching himself. In one unforgettable display of brutal reprisal, Gairy, angered by massive NJM — led mass protests, unleashed the terror against his opponents including the young lawyer Maurice Bishop. Six NJM members, Bishop included, were savagely beaten by his Mongoose Squad on Sunday November 18, 1973 — a day afterwards known as "Bloody Sunday." In January 1974 a general strike was called. The dock-workers who spearheaded it held out for three months. On the twenty-first of that month, Mr. Rupert Bishop, father of Maurice, was murdered by Gairy's "Mongoose Squad".

Independence came to Grenada in February of 1974. Allegations of electoral fraud accompanied Gairy's next election victory in 1976. Concerned and worried by the growing influence of the young NJM however, Gairy stepped up his policies of brutality and repression. The Mongoose Squad increased its bloody programme of violence. The prime targets were the top-ranking members of the NJM. But these new leaders of the Grenadian people, who by this time had become increasingly hostile to the Gairy regime, were readying themselves.

Early in March 1979 the NJM leadership received reliable reports that Gairy was planning their capture, torture and eventual demise even as he planned to be temporarily absent from the island. The NJM decided to act as it knew that the majority of the people, the army, all right-thinking Grenadians were on their side. The capture of the True Blue Army Headquarters was effected with swift precision during the wee hours of that fateful morning of March 13, 1979. All of Gairy's police stations were also quickly taken, most of them surrendering to the revolutionary forces of the NJM. After the

seizure of the lone radio station, it was at 10.30 a.m. (approximately) that Maurice Bishop, the 35 year-old barrister, went on the air to announce the formation and assumption of power of a Provisional Revolutionary Government under his leadership.

A new era had dawned for the island-state and people of Grenada. Gairy had fled to the United States. The People's Revolutionary Government (PRG) had been born on March 13, 1979. Its credo was: "Forward Ever, Backward Never".

SOME ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE NEW JEWEL MOVEMENT'S PEOPLE'S REVOLUTIONARY GOVERNMENT

A Look At Some Gains of the Revolution

Before the advent of the New Jewel Movement, literacy was running at a very low percentage; unemployment at 50 percent or 23,000 persons; no agro-industrial development, negative growth rate, no social security programme, rampant crime and prostitution and a constant, flagrant violation of human rights.

With the assumption of power in 1979 by the People's Revolutionary Government rapid strides were made during the four and a half years of the revolution.

The People's Revolutionary Government of Grenada achieved growth rates of 2 percent in 1979, 2.1 percent in 1980, 2 percent in 1981 and 5.5 percent in 1982. For 1983 the government had aimed to reach a growth rate of between 7.5 and 8.5 percent.

By June 1983 unemployment was reduced to 12% and was expected to be completely eradicated in 1985 with the imminent creation of new jobs in the expanded agro-industrial sector, the new airport complex, tourism and construction.

- * By 1982 the State had controlled about 25% of the economy.
- * Under the P.R.G. domestic investment grew from EC\$8 million in 1978 to EC\$109 million in 1982.
- * Gigantic strides in the improvement of Social Services: health, education, scholarships, uniforms; first National Insurance Scheme; loans for housing including the establishment of a Pre-Fab Housing Plant.
- * Diversification of agricultural production.
- * Diversification of the markets for those commodities.
- * Development of Grenada's fishing industry.
- * Full integration of Grenadian women into the revolutionary process.

The following abridged article entitled "WHAT WAS BURIED ALONG WITH BISHOP", was written by Cathy Sunshine, staff-member of the Washington-based Ecumenical Programme for Inter-American Communication and Action (EPICA), and was co-ordinating editor of EPICA's study, "Grenada: The Peaceful Revolution".

"The roster of achievements under the People's Revolutionary Government (PRG) is familiar to many on the left in the U.S. and indeed throughout the world. Rational and creative economic policies, an anti-elitist restructuring of education and health care and a broad-based spirit of voluntariness were the hallmarks of revolutionary Grenada. What is less well-known is how the programmes of the revolution directly addressed the legacies of colonialism so deeply entrenched in the political and economic structures of the Caribbean.

To take a small but symbolic example, it took a revolution for Grenada to begin producing its own salt-fish Nearly 150 years after the end of slavery, Grenada and the other islands were still importing salt-fish from Canada, instead of producing it from the rich fishing beds of the Caribbean.

At little expense and without high technology, the PRG built a fish-processing plant which now not only supplies Grenada with cheap salt-fish, but can also export to neighbouring islands. While apparently little more than common sense, this was a radical departure from the dependency economics of the Caribbean. There are many more examples to the credit of the Bishop government.

Judged in conventional economic terms, Grenada's revolution was shaping up as a success. According to the International Monetary Fund, the country's real Gross Domestic Product (all the goods and services produced within the country) grew by an average of 3% over the last four years making Grenada one of the few countries in the hemisphere to enjoy positive economic growth. The PRG's economic policies were also praised by the World Bank in an August 1982 memorandum which stated:

"The public investment program of the government stresses three sectors: agriculture (including fisheries), agro-industries, and tourism. The ongoing effort to improve infrastructure — particularly the construction of the new international airport, of roads and feeder roads, as well as investment in electric power and telephones—is designed to revitalize the three priority sectors."

It is in the field of education, health and social services where the Bishop government's special strength — its concern and respect for ordinary Grenadians — was most marked. For example, education — so fundamental to a people's ability to participate in government — has been treated with pointed neglect by many post-colonial leaders. This was certainly true of Gairy, whose educational policy could be summed up in a few words: Keep them ignorant to rule them better. . .

This colonial concept of education as an elite privilege was systematically refuted by the Bishop government. Soon after the revolution, the PRG implemented a broad-based literacy and adult education program modelled after similar efforts in Cuba and elsewhere, and designed with the help of Paulo Freire, the revolutionary Brazilian educator. Under the slogan "Each one teach one," volunteer tutors helped hundreds of Grenadians — mostly farmers and agricultural labourers — to achieve a functional literacy for the first time in their lives. To upgrade primary education, communities were encouraged to organize voluntary work brigades to renovate the decaying school buildings, using materials provided by the Government.

The programs of the Bishop government will doubtlessly be scrutinized in the coming months in an effort to answer the agonizing questions now emerging from the tragic disintegration of the PRG. Was the revolution on track or stagnating? Should Grenada have moved more decisively toward socialism? Ironically, such weighty questions may partly obscure the many successes of the Grenadian experiment and their significance for the rest of the region. While the New Jewel Movement's Central Committee wrestled with problems of progress and power, the 4 year-old revolution had already won the support of Grenadians and offered the people of the Caribbean an alternative model of development and change."



PAPER TWO: GUYANA-GRENADA RELATIONS

(i) ESTABLISHMENT OF DIPLOMATIC TIES

Guyana initially established diplomatic ties with Grenada on May 28, 1969 with the appointment of the late Mrs. Winifred Gaskin as Commissioner to the Associated States of the United Kingdom, of which Grenada is a member state. Her appointment fostered a closer involvement of the two developing states in efforts for mutual development, through bilateral and regional co-operation.

Relations were further strengthened upon the accrediting of Mr. Frederick Hilborn Talbot as High Commissioner of Guyana on February 4, 1977 at St. George's Grenada. In his speech at the accreditation ceremony, Mr. Talbot, on behalf of the President of the Cooperative Republic of Guyana, declared that "the people of Guyana desire to continue to work with the people of Grenada in the spirit of friendship, brotherhood and equality towards further strengthening of regional bonds".

Grenada had endorsed the establishment of Diplomatic Relations with Guyana when Mrs. Florence A.I. Rapier was accredited in Georgetown as the first Grenadian High Commissioner to Guyana, on July 2, 1976.

2. CO-OPERATION

Guyana and Grenada, as members of CARIFTA had been committed to mutual considerations on trade. These were confined to food and local manufactures, on a preferential basis.

The signing of the Treaty of Chaguaramas in 1973 establishing CARICOM created the potential for a much wider scope of cooperation between Guyana and Grenada. This embodied the strengthening, co-ordinating and the promotion of social, cultural and technological development of member states through the integration movement.

Guyana, based on its regard for the national sovereignty of an independent state, respected the Government of Grenada under the Leadership of Prime Minister, Mr. Eric Gairy, despite divergence in political focus; and strove to realise the objectives of CARICOM. This commitment was pronounced in the High Commissioner's speech to the Prime Minister of Grenada, urging that "we (Guyana/Grenada) should see CARICOM as essential for promoting and protecting the sovereignty and independence of members as well as for advancing through self-reliance, the social, cultural and economic development of the people of our region. We look forward to Grenada continuing to play a vital role in our Caribbean Community."

By year 1979 the Guyana/Grenada relations had not developed to any significant level to be termed as splendid but rather were still in need of more involvement on the bilateral level. This was partially achieved during the period of Leadership by Mr. Maurice Bishop who seized power on March 13, 1979.

On March 13, 1979, Prime Minister, Sir Eric Gairy was overthrown in a coup led by Mr. Maurice Bishop, (of the Opposition People's Alliance) who assumed the premiership in a "People's Revolutionary Government (PRG)". Immediately after the new Government came into power the 1974 Constitution was suspended. This was followed by an announcement on March 27, by the new Government of its intention to create a People's Consultative Assembly "made up of representatives of all sectors of the population" to draft a new Constitution.

The day after the coup, an extraordinary meeting of CARICOM Ministers was held in Barbados, (14-15 March), to discuss the situation in Grenada. Except for Trinidad and Tobago which offered no reason for its non-attendance at the meeting, all the other independent CARICOM member States were present. Grenada was represented by Mr. George Louison, Minister of Education, Social Affairs, Community Development, Youth and Sport.

The question of recognition was raised at the meeting and Guyana, along with Jamaica, supported a call for early recognition of the P.R.G. This was in contrast to the stand adopted by the smaller Eastern Caribbean States which opposed such recognition fearing that it would set a precedent for similar uprisings in the region.

Though no decision was reached at the meeting, on the question of recognition, the Government of Guyana subsequently announced its recognition of the Bishop Government on March 21, 1979. This was later followed by an announcement by Guyana that a "political and technical team" would be sent to Grenada for discussion on the possible establishment of a separate central bank, a "streamlining" of the Treasury and an assessment of Grenada's overall financial situation, including that country's external debt.

Evidence of Guyana's friendly relationship with Grenada was seen in a joint declaration (St. Lucia, Grenada, Jamaica, Guyana — October, 1979) criticising the Carter Administration for its intention to reinforce military capability in the Caribbean. They agreed *inter alia*, to "preserve the Caribbean area as a zone of peace free from the great power of rivalry" and expressed their wish that no decision affecting the Caribbean should be taken by a major power "without proper consultation with involvement of the sovereign governments which represent the inhabitants of the region."

On October 6, 1980, the new Guyana Constitution came into effect and in December 1980, elections were held and the ruling People's National Congress Party was returned to power with President L.F.S. Burnham holding the Office as Executive President.

The end of 1979 saw no elections in Grenada, as promised by the Bishop Government, nor the establishment of a revised Constitution for the people of that island. While this situation was creating growing concern among the CARICOM countries, Guyana adopted a position of respect for the internal affairs of a Sovereign State.

By 1981, Grenada's involvement in the Non-Aligned Movement and more so in her association with the Eastern-bloc countries was viewed with antagonism by the United States. This engendered economic pressure and subtle propaganda attacks on Grenada by the United States Administration.

Consequently, in July, 1981, there was a cabinet reorganization in Grenada, the purpose being to place Grenada on a "war footing in the face of economic aggression and propaganda destabilization by the United States."

Although Guyana had voted with the U.S. in condemning the Soviet intervention of Afghanistan in 1980, when Grenada voted in favour of the Soviet action, she rallied to the cause of Grenada by supporting her later in 1981, at the EEC-ACP meeting when the question of funds for Grenada's new airport project was raised. (The U.S. had made representations to the EEC countries requesting them not to give aid to Grenada for the project).

The early months of 1982 saw both Guyana and Grenada facing American hostility by way of the Caribbean Basin Initiative which excluded both countries from benefitting from U.S. aid to the region.

Throughout 1982, Guyana remained firm in her support for the development of Grenada, free from external intervention. While the OECS member states informed Grenada that they would change their stand and start to accept foreign multilateral aid offered on terms which excluded Grenada, Guyana stood as a friend with that isolated island in the Caribbean.

There was some disagreement earlier in the year with regard to Argentina and her conflict with Britain over the Falkland Islands in April. Whereas Guyana and the rest of CARICOM supported Britain, Grenada gave her support to Argentina. This, however, did not seriously dampen relationships with the two countries. November of that same year saw both countries at the third CARICOM Heads of Government Meeting in Jamaica.

Guyana and Grenada were represented at the Fourth Heads of Government Meeting held in Trinidad and Tobago in July, 1983.

In October this year, the Bishop Government was overthrown and the Prime Minister was assassinated. This was followed by the invasion of the island by U.S.-led troops and those of the Organization of Eastern Caribbean States (OECS), Barbados and Jamaica.

Guyana expressed her condemnation for the action taken by those external forces, and this was made clear both at the United Nations and at the Commonwealth Heads of Government Summit held in New Delhi in November.

THE OCTOBER 1983 CRISIS: EVENTS AS THEY HAPPENED

- OCTOBER 14** Prime Minister Maurice Bishop reported under house arrest, but no clear indication was given as to who was heading the Government.
- OCTOBER 17** Commander-in-Chief of the Grenadian Armed Forces, General Hudson Austin in a broadcast on Radio Free Grenada monitored in other Caribbean countries said that the Central Committee of the ruling Socialist New Movement, had voted to oust Bishop from power and the Party, and then agreed to review his future in the People's Revolutionary Government.
- OCTOBER 18** Foreign Affairs Minister Unison Whiteman announced his resignation and that of three other Ministers from the Government.
- OCTOBER 19** General Hudson Austin announced that the Prime Minister and his colleagues — Unison Whiteman, Vincent Noel, Jacqueline Creft, Norris Bain and Fitzroy Bain — were among persons killed in St. George's, Grenada's capital during a protest march. The People's Revolutionary Government was dissolved and a sixteen-member Revolutionary Military Council headed by General Hudson Austin was established in the country. The Military Council imposed a four-day twenty-four-hour-a-day curfew throughout the country.
- OCTOBER 22** Twelve Caricom Government Leaders met in Trinidad and Tobago to discuss the Grenada situation. Guyana, Trinidad and Tobago, Belize and the Bahamas strongly opposed military intervention suggested by Jamaica, Barbados and the O.E.C.S.
- OCTOBER 23** President Forbes Burnham at a press conference in Trinidad and Tobago brought newsmen up-to-date on his country's position on the Grenada situation.
- OCTOBER 24** Guyana's Foreign Affairs Minister addressed the United Nations (the occasion of the U.N.'s 38th Anniversary.) He told the world forum that Guyana maintains its unswerving conviction that strict adherence to the provision of the UN charter could reduce global tension and improve the international environment.

- OCTOBER 25** United States of America-led invasion into Grenada. The United States of America was supported by a small contingent of soldiers from the O.E.C.S. states, Barbados and Jamaica. President Forbes Burnham in a radio broadcast to the Guyanese nation in the evening strongly condemned the U.S.-led invasion of Grenada.
- OCTOBER 26** President Forbes Burnham hosted a press conference. He outlined Guyana's principled position on the Grenada situation.
- OCTOBER 27** Mass Solidarity Rally hosted by the People's National Congress at Sophia Auditorium.
- OCTOBER 28** Mass demonstrations by P.N.C., P.P.P., and other organisations in front of the U.S. embassy. The demonstrators then marched to Parliament Buildings. A motion condemning the U.S. and the six Caricom States — for invading Grenada received unanimous support from parliamentarians during the Parliamentary debate on the Grenada situation.
- OCTOBER 29** Specially-convened meeting of the United Nations Security Council to discuss the Grenada invasion. Guyana, along with Zimbabwe and Nicaragua submitted a Draft Resolution for consideration by the Council which the proposers felt reflect the feelings of indignation over the invasion of the Caricom State. The resolution was not adopted because of a negative vote by the United States of America which is a Permanent Member of the Security Council and has powers of veto.
- OCTOBER 31** Guyana's President, Forbes Burnham wrote members of the United Nations Security Council expressing his government's gratitude for their support for the Guyana resolution deploring the U.S.-led invasion of Grenada.
- The ten member-countries to whose leaders letters were sent were China, France, Jordan, Malta, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Poland, the Soviet Union and Zimbabwe.
- NOVEMBER 1** Fighting reportedly stopped on October 31. (It was reported that Barbados was defeated (38-106) by Peru for the Latin America and Caribbean seat on the Security Council of the U.N.)
- NOVEMBER 2** The U.S. and Caribbean invaders of Grenada failed to prevent the United Nations General Assembly from deciding to hold a full-scale debate on the situation in Grenada in which the majority of the 158 members condemned the U.S.-led invasion and called for an immediate withdrawal of all foreign troops from Grenada.



THE SELL OUT

GRENADA AND CARICOM: THE FOLLY AND THE TRAGEDY

by Courtney Gibson (Georgetown 83-10-24)

After close to one week of confusing, confused and sometimes distorted reports about what was supposed to be happening in St. Georges, the Grenada capital, General Hudson Austin sought to clear the air in his no-nonsense military voice around 23:15 GST last Wednesday night.

"The revolutionary armed forces were forced to storm the fort (Rupert) and in the process, the following persons were killed: Maurice Bishop, Unison Whiteman, Vincent Noel, Jacqueline Creft, Norris Bain and Fitzroy Bain among others."

And so it was that the world learnt that Maurice Bishop, the magnetic, electrifying and charismatic tall and bearded revolutionary leader of Grenada who had come to power in a coup in 1979, had met a violent death at the hands of his own armed forces.

And so it was, too, that the world learnt that the People's Revolutionary Government of Grenada had been dissolved; that a 16-member revolutionary Military Council headed by General Hudson Austin, had been established to run the country; that a four-day, 24-hours-per-day, curfew had been imposed throughout Grenada and that violators of the curfew were liable to be shot on sight.

The reaction throughout the Caribbean was quick and sharp. It varied from expressions of shock and disbelief to downright naivette and hysterics from friend and foe alike of the late Maurice Bishop.

The actors included the uninitiated, and unliberated Caribbean man-in-the-street and, strangely enough, responsible Caribbean people in leadership positions who had no intellectual difficulties with advocating interference in the internal affairs of the Spice Isle and, worse yet, outside (foreign) military intervention in the affairs of a sister Caricom state.

Today, just under one week after Hudson Austin somewhat unceremoniously announced Maurice Bishop's untimely death and one day after a disappointing, informal Caricom Summit in Port-of-Spain, there are still more unanswered questions than there have been answers.

There are still several versions as to how Bishop met his death. There are some including at least two Caribbean Prime Ministers who have rejected General Austin's version and who are contending that Bishop and his close colleagues were executed.

And even before his death, when it was learnt that he was under house arrest, one Caribbean Prime Minister publicly suggested that an outside country (Cuba) was now "calling the shots" in Grenada.

Many of the public pronouncements since Friday October 14 when it was learnt that Bishop was under house arrest, and moreso, since Wednesday, October 19 when Bishop's death was announced, did absolutely nothing to promote an early resolution of the Regional crisis.

Instead many of the statements and pronouncements tended to inflame further what was already a badly inflamed situation.

It was, therefore, very heartening news when it was learnt that the Caribbean leaders planned getting together to discuss the crisis with a view to promoting its early resolution.

By then, however, the ship of commonsense was already adrift in the Caribbean sea — a feature which must have contributed in no small measure to the paucity of success at the just concluded informal Caricom Summit.

President Forbes Burnham said he was not satisfied with the outcome of the summit and conference Chairman Prime Minister George Chambers of Trinidad and Tobago said it was a "very, very difficult meeting."

An understanding of the key issues involved at the moment is crucial to an understanding of why the informal Caricom Summit did not meet with the measure of success many had hoped for.

These key issues include the question of recognition of the new regime in Grenada, the question of armed or other forms of intervention in the internal affairs of a sister Caricom state and the question of Grenada's membership in Caricom.

Other major issues, of course, include the imposition of sanctions against, and the nature of those sanctions.

By the time the meeting of the Heads was convened around 22:00 hours (GST) last Saturday, it was clear that there was much sympathy abroad for some form of intervention (military or other) by Caricom Governments possibly with "outside" support in order to deal with the situation in the Spice Isle.

It was evident however, that much of this "sympathy" was riding on a wave of emotionalism rather than on a wave of enlightened thinking.

Saturday's issue of the "Trinidad Express", for example, provided a good measure of the degree of emotionalism that was abroad and which was being fuelled by some sections of the media in the region.

The "Express" vitriolic editorial on Saturday, seemed to have one thing in mind: Helping to set the stage for an armed intervention in Grenada's internal affairs with the hope of overthrowing those who are now in control.

The editorial called on regional governments to "take a firm decision to mount a security force to enter Grenada and free the people from this terror" and it was riddled with emotive language.

On no less than 12 occasions, for example, expressions such as "The Butchers in St. George's", "The Clique of Murderers," "The Gangsters," and "Those Murderers" were used in the editorial. The editorial in the Trinidad "Guardian" of the same date was no different.

Perhaps, it was excusable that the uninitiated should advocate such action without thinking seriously about the far-reaching implications. The tragedy of it all, however, was that some Caricom leaders present at the weekend summit seriously advocated intervention and (very suspiciously) seemed to be in favour of intervention from anywhere if the regional effort did not succeed in restoring normalcy in Grenada.

Guyana, of course, maintains a clear and unequivocal position in support of the sacred and internationally accepted principle of non-interference of the affairs of sovereign states and as such was firmly against any intervention in Grenada's internal affairs.

(Reports at the end of the meeting said the Bahamas, Belize and Trinidad and Tobago were also against intervention).

The haste with which some governments seemed prepared to mount a military force to invade Grenada must be considered a worrying development for clearly they must realise that such action could

help open the floodgates for armed and other forms of foreign intervention in the internal affairs of their own countries.

An important question which the people of the Caribbean will have to deliberate upon is whether sanctioning military intervention — regional or extra-regional — in the internal affairs of a sovereign state, they would be forfeiting the moral right to condemn similar intervention by other states in the internal affairs of states in any part of the world.

Another worrying development is the seeming singlemindedness of the majority of Caricom members states in their pursuit of the expulsion or suspension of Grenada from the integration movement.

This singlemindedness was so evident at the weekend gathering of leaders that even though the meeting itself was not formally constituted in keeping with the treaty of Chaguaramas, and even though there was no unanimous decision as is required, the conference Chairman announced at a press conference that Grenada has been suspended from the movement.

This is an interesting development. To begin with, Grenada was not invited to the meeting so that at best the weekend session was an informal gathering of 12 of 13 leaders and not a duly constituted heads of Government conference for which all members should be invited.

In addition, Guyana was firmly against expulsion or suspension. And as President Burnham explained at a press conference yesterday (Sunday) the majority view that Grenada should be suspended becomes worthless in terms of the Caricom Treaty which, in an issue like this, calls for unanimity.

However, in the view of the Conference chairman, the decision to suspend Grenada was "a political decision demonstrating political will" and "if somebody wants to challenge that in the international court at the Hague, they may do so!"

That seems to be some interesting food for thought — and for possible action — for the region's leading legal minds.

The folly and the tragedy of these recent developments, however, is that while all Caricom leaders have been very solicitous of the welfare of the 110,000 Grenadians, some seem bent on causing untold hardships for the very people they are ostensibly trying to protect.

Wisdom, one would imagine, suggests that the better approach during this challenging period would be, first of all, to establish contact with the authorities in Grenada, ascertain the facts about what happened there recently, and about what is happening there now and, at the same time, recognise and accept as fact, the new "reality" prevailing in Grenada today.

Lots of blood has already been shed. The likely consequences of an armed intervention is mind-boggling.



THE SELL-OUT

ADDRESS TO THE NATION ON THE GRENADA SITUATION BY HIS EXCELLENCY, COMRADE L.F.S. BURNHAM, O.E., S.C. PRESIDENT OF THE CO-OPERATIVE REPUBLIC OF GUYANA TUESDAY, OCTOBER 25, 1983

Comrades, Fellow Guyanese,

On Friday before last, the 14th October, we in Guyana learnt that there was an internal rift in the New Jewel Movement which forms the Government of Grenada. After a series of events many of which remain unclear, after a series of rumours, contradictory reports, we learnt of the untimely and tragic death of the former Prime Minister of Grenada, Maurice Bishop, and a number of his ministerial colleagues and close political allies. We were most saddened and deeply regretted these deaths, especially that of Maurice Bishop.

In a public statement on Thursday last I communicated Guyana's sadness and concern and expressed the hope that the Grenadian people would "... seek to heal their wounds and, as a united nation, to determine their future destiny within Caricom and in the wider International Community." It was my view that whatever were the causes of the tragedy, it was for the Grenadian people to settle their problems ... and to order their future as **they** saw fit. At the same time I despatched a message of condolence to the late Maurice Bishop's mother, which ended with the words "... It should be no small consolation for you to know that your son devoted his life to the cause of his country and people."

On Friday last, I received an invitation from the Honourable Mr. George Chambers, Prime Minister of Trinidad and Tobago and the present CARICOM Chairman inviting me to an emergency meeting of twelve CARICOM Heads of Government to be held in Port-of-Spain on the evening of Saturday, October 22nd.

At great inconvenience I accepted the invitation for I felt that the region of CARICOM might have been able to assist the Grenadians in any solution which they themselves sought. At the adjournment of the first session, which lasted until after 3.00 a.m. on Sunday, the Chairman, Mr. Chambers, announced the consensus with which Guyana agreed. The most important aspects of this consensus were that any resolution of the Grenadian situation —

- a) should be wholly regional in nature;
- b) should not violate International Law and/or the United Nations Charter;
- c) should have the restoration to normalcy in Grenada as its primary purpose;
- d) should have no external intervention, particularly in so far as extra-regional military intervention is concerned;
- e) and further that a CARICOM fact-finding mission obviously acceptable to the Grenadian Authorities should be appointed from amongst eminent CARICOM citizens; and
- f) that the point of contact might be the present Governor General of Grenada who is constitutionally the Queen's representative.

Later on Sunday morning when the meeting resumed, sometime after 10.00 o'clock certain participants insisted that there had not been a consensus earlier and by majority resolved that Grenada should be deemed to have been expelled from CARICOM. The word "deemed" had to be used for the meeting was informal and could not under the CARICOM Treaty be properly constituted, since Grenada had not been invited in the first place.

Further, under the CARICOM Treaty, as was recognised at the Summits of Ochos Rios, Jamaica, in 1982 and at Port-of-Spain, Trinidad & Tobago, in July 1983, any major decision must be unanimous.

Guyana opposed any expulsion, deemed or otherwise. The Organisation of Eastern Caribbean States (OECS) Group supported by the representatives of Barbados and Jamaica refused to accept the previous consensus especially in so far as it abjured outside intervention and it became clear that such outside intervention was contemplated and actively supported by all with the notable exceptions of Trinidad and Tobago, Guyana, the Bahamas and Belize.

Today at 06.40 a.m. Guyana time, 05.40 a.m. Grenada time, United States troops landed on Grenadian soil, at the request of the OECS, Jamaica and Barbados to ensure the withdrawal of United States citizens on the island who in fact are not and have never been in danger. In any case how can these states which are external to Grenada legitimise any invasion or intervention by the United States Government? The whole thing is contrary to International Law and the Charter of the United Nations as well as to the Declaration of the Inadmissibility of Intervention and Interference in the Internal Affairs of States, subscribed to and supported by all CARICOM countries who were members of the United Nations when it was agreed by the General Assembly of the United Nations in December 1981.

Today in the House of Commons of Great Britain, the Prime Minister, Mrs. Margaret Thatcher and the Foreign Secretary, Sir Geoffrey Howe stated that the United Kingdom Government was informed by the United States of the proposed invasion only late yesterday and had advised against it.

The United Nations Secretary-General has refused to comment on the situation in Grenada prior to the invasion because in his view, which view is obviously correct, any comment would amount to interference in the internal affairs of a sovereign country. A spokesman for the White House has accepted the fact that there was no threat to United States citizens in Grenada but what is more interesting is that we have a situation where an ally of Britain has without any justification whatsoever under the International Law, invaded one of Her Majesty's dominions.

Comrades, however unfortunate may be the events over the past twelve days in Grenada, and I concede they have been unfortunate, and I would further concede that they have been tragic, they cannot justify military intervention and aggression. The Government of Guyana condemns this invasion and seeks to have an immediate withdrawal of United States forces. Today, Grenada, tomorrow Guyana and the day after tomorrow someone else.

At a time when the Contadora Group consisting of Venezuela, Panama, Colombia and Mexico takes a stand against outside interference in the internal affairs of Central America, we in the Caribbean are witnessing such outside interference instigated and/or supported by a group of Caribbean countries, a group that has not thought its position through, has not recognised that here we have a case of the re-introduction of colonialism and imperialism by invitation here today in the Caribbean. We have a group most members of which are members of the Non-Aligned Movement, which has as one of its principles, the 'Non-Interference in the Internal Affairs of Sovereign States.'

While this group seeks to reintroduce colonialism and imperialism into the Caribbean, there has come opposition to this latest act of aggression from countries like Canada, Sweden, France and the Dominican Republic, and the Caribbean Council of Churches has also expressed its disapproval and opposition to the action taken today.

Your Government has consulted with the Opposition and has good reason to believe that when Parliament meets very shortly before the end of this week, there will appear absolutely no difference between the Government and the Opposition on this most vital question. There will shortly be a meeting of the Security Council of which Guyana is a member and when our representative speaks, we expect that he will speak knowing that regardless of political and maybe ideological differences in Guyana there is unanimity among the parties represented in Parliament on the illegality, the immorality of the invasion of Grenada.

Steps will be taken by my Government to inform the Non-Aligned Movement of which we are a member and to seek support of our proposition from the members of that Group.

The Chairman of CARICOM has already been communicated with and will receive a further communication. If we do not take a stand, our hard-earned independence is a mere notion, a chimera.

At this time, our hearts, our sympathy and our support go out to the Grenadian people who are being treated as less than mortals, thanks to the connivance of some groups within our Region and the big brother in our hemisphere.

I hope to speak to you again at a Press Conference tomorrow, Wednesday and again at a Rally arranged to take place at the Conference Centre at Sophia on Thursday evening.

There occurred to me some lines "...never send to know for whom the bell tolls. It tolls for thee."

OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

October 25, 1983

STATEMENT MADE BY CDE. L.F.S. BURNHAM O.E.,S.C.
ON EVENTS IN GRENADA AT PRESS CONFERENCE
HELD ON OCTOBER 26, 1983
GEORGETOWN, GUYANA

Comrades,

You are undoubtedly aware of the grave danger which threatens Grenada in particular, and the Caribbean in general as a result of the US military invasion of that island.

Last evening, I addressed the Nation on this matter because I felt that our people should be oriented and sensitised to the situation and the implications.

I propose now to state briefly Guyana's position on the matter, and to focus primarily on two areas which would seem to demand major emphasis. These are the purported expulsion of Grenada from CARICOM and the military intervention which subsequently took place.

Some twelve days ago, on Friday October 14, 1983, we received reports that serious differences had arisen in the leadership of the New Jewel Movement, the Grenadian Ruling Party. Our hope at that time was that those differences would have been resolved.

Unfortunately, they gave way to a series of events which eventually led to the tragic death of the Prime Minister, Maurice Bishop and several members of his Cabinet.

I take this opportunity to reiterate my shock and sadness at these events because Grenada and Guyana, both being member states of CARICOM and the Non-Aligned Movement, had developed close relations at various levels of leadership.

It was within this context that I accepted the invitation to participate in the informal discussions in Trinidad last weekend.

As I have stated elsewhere at that meeting, although a consensus was reached on several vital aspects, to my dismay, certain Heads of CARICOM later denied that such a consensus was arrived at.

In retrospect, their position can be understood since as is now common knowledge, these Heads of Government had invited the United States to invade the Sovereign State of Grenada under the pretext of restoring law and order and of removing a perceived threat to their own security.

The representatives of the OECS along with those of Jamaica and Barbados having rejected the earlier consensus succeeded in having accepted a decision to deem Grenada to be expelled from CARICOM. This Guyana opposed, not only because the meeting lacked such competence, but also because we considered it wrong in principle.

This said group having rejected the consensus arrived at the first session freed itself, or at least so it thought, of the need to abide by the norms of International Law and the Charter of the United Nations. It further refused to accept that any solution should be of a regional nature and that there should be no external intervention. It made clear that it held itself free to seek outside support and intervention if it deemed fit in its wisdom.

From information now at our disposal, the invading United States and Caribbean forces drawn from Jamaica, Barbados and the OECS began assembling on Sunday afternoon in Barbados and the onslaught was launched on Tuesday morning.

As I said in my Statement to the Nation yesterday, the OECS and its allies, Jamaica and Barbados have no legal or moral right to invade the sovereign state of Grenada, nor can their request to the United States to join in, in fact to lead the invasion, be justified on any grounds. The whole exercise is in breach of International Law and is contrary to the United Nations Charter as well as the 1981 United Nations Declaration of Inadmissibility of Intervention and Interference in the Internal Affairs of Sovereign States.

Former colonials now seek to introduce colonialism and imperialism into our region, and the United States is an active party of the breach of law, allegedly to re-establish law and order.

It is for the Grenadian people to settle their own internal problems and not for anyone to dictate the solution or what type of government they should have. For the OECS to rely on the Treaty establishing that body is for it to rely on a broken reed.

Here in CARICOM, in the Non-Aligned Movement, in the Security Council and elsewhere, the Guyana Government calls for the immediate withdrawal of all foreign troops — OECS, Barbadian, Jamaica and American from Grenada.

Office of the President

October 26, 1983

The President Elaborates:

**Excerpts from the Question-and-Answer
Session at the Press Conference Hosted
By President Burnham — Wednesday October 26, 1983**

- QUESTION:** You said just now in your statement "in retrospect. . ." I wonder if you got the impression when you arrived in Trinidad that the O.E.C.S. members had already invited the United States to invade Grenada.
- COMRADE PRESIDENT:** No. I got that impression by early Sunday morning.
- QUESTION:** Do you see the invasion of Grenada led by the American troops and the participation of the O.E.C.S. states — O.E.C.S. countries — as a threat to the future of Caricom?
- COMRADE PRESIDENT:** Yes it does. From two points of view: it has caused a very sharp division of position, so far as position is concerned, between the four of us who object to it completely — to it Trinidad and Tobago, Belize, Bahamas and Guyana — as against the rest who are actively involved on the other side, and secondly, it leads one to believe that unless we are very careful and we do succeed in rallying Caribbean and world opinion against such invasions that all the CARICOM states stand a threat of being invaded if some quislings were to invite outside powers to intervene because they don't like our particular form of Government or any policy which Caribbean State Member of CARICOM may be pursuing.
- * * * * *
- QUESTION:** Can you say, Comrade President, that the situation created by the invasion of Grenada seems to have set back CARICOM which appeared by the two recent Summits to have been making very good progress recently?
- COMRADE PRESIDENT:** I would say yes and in two ways. We cannot have any more Summits, we cannot have any more meetings of any organs of CARICOM, and of course, it means that the relations within CARICOM at the moment are not as smooth as relations ought to be in a common market or community. But I guess that time can possibly heal wounds and usher in some wisdom.
- QUESTION:** Our immediate objectives is the immediate withdrawal of the foreign troops. After that, how do you see Caribbean initiative to the normalisation of relations between Grenada and the rest of the Caribbean?
- COMRADE PRESIDENT:** If Grenada agrees and I have reason from what I heard around the table, it would agree, because actually, the Grenadian Government had agreed that the Head of their Government could meet the head of the St. Vincent Government to discuss certain questions; if the Grenadian Government agrees, we can have conversations, we can give advice but in the final analysis they have to decide. You see, what worries me is that with one exception, Montserrat, you had around the table governments of countries that have recently won independence, and when we are agitating for independence or fighting for independence, we said: . . . "look we want to make our decisions, we want to run our country." How people who have such an immediate memory of colonial rule could then become colonialists? It's something that really worries me.

QUESTION:

Cde. President, the last time I was here at one of your press conferences, when you came back from Cancun where you met President Reagan. Since then, we all know that he has been making statements about humanism, morality, human rights, freedom, etc. In view of this rape of the sovereignty of Grenada, how would you assess this man Reagan firstly, and I want to ask you a follow-up, how do you assess Guyana-United States relationship after this "bandit attack" on Grenada?

COMRADE PRESIDENT:

Well first thing I would say is that looking at what has recently happened in Grenada, obviously we have different definitions and concepts as to what amounts to "democracy" and "human rights" and we are both indulging in our democratic rights to define any concept the way we are led to define it. I would say that relations between the United States of America and the Co-operative Republic of Guyana are formally good.



REACTIONS FROM GUYANA

The immediate Guyanese reaction to the dastardly invasion of Grenada was a wave of widespread vocal and very demonstrative condemnation. From protest-rallies and resolutions to debates and demonstrations, Guyanese, through their political parties, Trade Unions, professional groups — and INDIVIDUALLY — all expressed their abhorrence of the US/O.E.C.S. violation of the principle of non-interference.

The following are excerpts and extracts from speeches, statements and Resolutions indicating Guyana's reaction to the invasion:

(i) **STATEMENT BY HIS EXCELLENCY NOEL G. SINCLAIR
OF GUYANA IN THE U.N. SECURITY COUNCIL
(October 25, 1983. (ABRIDGED))**

Mr. President, Guyana has maintained a principled approach to the recent tragic events in Grenada. While expressing our profound grief at these developments we nevertheless nourished the hope that the people of Grenada would seek to heal their wounds and as a united nation, determine their future destiny with CARICOM and in the wider international community.

As a general principle, Guyana is willing to participate in the mobilisation of CARICOM forces to defend the integrity of any CARICOM State against an external aggressor. We are no less willing to participate in any CARICOM Peacekeeping Force in certain circumstances and under agreed terms of reference.

With specific regard to Grenada, however, we were, and continue to be opposed to participation in any military invasion of Grenada since such action constitutes interference in the internal affairs of this state. We were of the view that the despatch of a fact-finding mission to Grenada composed of CARICOM nationals could be a helpful step.

The Declaration on Friendly Relations also sets forth the principle that states shall settle their international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security and justice are not endangered.

As recently as December 1981 the General Assembly adopted the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention and Interference in the Internal Affairs of States. That Declaration sets out in crystal clear language the duties comprehended in the principle of non-intervention and non-interference. These duties include:

"The duty of states to refrain, in their international relations, from the threat or use of force in any form whatsoever to violate the existing international boundaries of another state, to disrupt the political, social or economic order of other states, to overthrow or change the political system of another state or its government, to cause tension between or among states or to deprive peoples of their national identity and cultural heritage;

The duty of a state to refrain from armed intervention, subversion, military occupation or any other form of intervention and interference, overt or covert,

directed at another state or group of states or any act of military, political or economic interference in the internal affairs of another state, including acts of reprisal involving the use of force.

The duty of a state to refrain from any action or attempt in whatever form, or under whatever pretext, to destabilise or to undermine the stability of another state or of any of its institutions”.

Mr. President, my delegation, has this evening tabled a draft resolution which approaches the current situation in Grenada from the perspective of the Charter of the United Nations, the time-honoured and sacred principles which lie at the heart of our international organisation, and the obligations on all states to strictly abide by these principles in their international behaviour.

Mr. President, the hostility of the United States Administration towards the Government of the late Prime Minister Maurice Bishop — American concern about who Grenada's friends were, are no secret to anyone in this Chamber. What my delegation finds painfully disturbing is the fact that, at a moment when the states of our region are intensifying their efforts to have the Caribbean recognised as a zone of peace and to strengthen the security of the states of our region, some of my CARICOM colleagues appear, by their action, to be endorsing this hostility towards Grenada and to be concurring in outside intervention in the affairs of the region. Such action can only be harmful to our region.

Mr. President, a policy of choosing Government for others and meting out punishment to those which are considered unacceptable is as alien to the political traditions of the Caribbean as were the disturbing events which occurred in Grenada last week. Guyana is not aware of the existence of any instrument or arrangement which authorises intervention in any Caribbean state. Grenada posed no threat to any of its neighbours. My delegation understands that all foreigners on the islands were safe and that at the no time was their welfare in question.

The members of the Caribbean Community — which includes all the members of the expeditionary force — have long stated their acknowledgement that ideological pluralism is a reality and must be respected. The explanations advanced for today's intervention are at great variance with that stated belief. The need to tolerate other people's choice of developmental paths and choice of political strategy is the basis of respect for ideological pluralism. Thus, the view expressed that the Bishop Government was alien to the political environment of the Caribbean is a thinly-disguised attempt by some states to impose their choice of political strategy upon another state. It is no coincidence that the chosen instrument for their imposition and intervention was the superpower diametrically opposed on ideological grounds to the Bishop Government. The question which now arises is whether the intervention is a reaction to events taking place after Bishop's death or whether it is designed to ensure the total demise of Bishop's legacy.

Mr. President, Guyana sits here truly concerned at the dangers which the present intervention generates. For when States arrogate to themselves the right to seek help to destroy the Governments of those States whose policies they find disagreeable, then who among us can feel safe? The claim has been advanced that this intervention is in pursuit of peace and democracy but is not the true test of democracy in international relations the ability to tolerate those who do not follow our every-whim and fancy or the whims and fancies of our partners? If the international system cannot find it democratic and just that the small, the poor, the weak be protected from the large and powerful, then I fear that far from being democratic, we are instead submitting to a Hobbesian system which recognises only the powerful, the fittest and only their interests. Democracy has thus been poorly served in Grenada today.

With regard to the future, Mr. President, my delegation sees the adoption and implementation of the draft resolution we have proposed as a first step towards the restoration of the normalcy in Grenada which we all desire.



The hospital in St. George's became one of the first targets of the US planes.

(ii) EXCERPTS OF ADDRESS BY CDE. RASHLEIGH JACKSON,
MINISTER OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS
TO THE NATIONAL ASSEMBLY —
FRIDAY OCTOBER 28, 1983.

Comrade Speaker,

"I spent 33 years, most of my time, being a high-class muscle man for big business, for Wall Street and the Bankers. In short, I was a racketeer for capitalism. I helped purify Nicaragua for the international banking house of Brown brothers in 1909-1912. I helped make Mexico and especially Tampico safe for American Oil interests in 1914. I brought light to the Dominican Republic for sugar interests in 1916. I helped make Haiti and Cuba a decent place for the National City Bank boys to collect revenue in. I helped in the rape of half a dozen Central American Republics for the benefit of Wall Street."

Those, Cde. Speaker, are the words of Brigadier General Smedley Butler who was the highest ranking officer in the Marine Corps of the United States Army in 1934. Those words, I suggest, describe the historical role of U.S. imperialism in this region. It was an imperialism that had as its clear, identifiable and unwavering objective making Central America, the Caribbean and Latin America safe for the promotion of United States interests — financial, economic, military and political. In those days it was relatively easy for American imperialism to run rampant throughout our region. The decision to send the marines was one taken very easily and gunboats were despatched. Those were the days of the big stick; a situation which the Minority Leader so aptly described, as well as its extension beyond Latin America into the wider international community.

Today, however, we witness a somewhat changed world. There are new centres of power in the international community. We have the rise of the European Community; we have the rise of new financial centres, like OPEC; and we have the rise of the developing countries. We have also, Cde. Speaker, the consolidation of a global specialist revolution led by the Soviet Union; and we have a situation in which the post-colonial revolution, which sees Guyana as an independent member of the International Community, is making its mark on the decisions in the International Community. These changes, some more dramatic than others, some more important than others, have had an effect in the evolution of international law which takes account, at least partially, of these changes. My distinguished colleague, Vice President Shahabuddeen, did allude to many international legal documents which codified and which sanctified new norms of international law which one hopes would have a permanence in terms of guiding the relations between states. These changes have brought about as well, the opportunity for a wider international solidarity, a wider solidarity between parties, a wider solidarity between workers' organisations and a wider solidarity between Socialist organisations.

These are important inputs in the conduct of international relations and can help, if properly used, to guide the course of international relations. So that I would say today that, having regard to these changes and these evolutions one would have thought that the naked exercise of power as was the practice of imperialism in the 19th century, and the early part of this one, had been eternally prescribed. Be that as it may, the objectives of imperialism have however not changed. The maxim remains: "Do as I do, not as I say"; and the search is ever present for attracting adherents who succumb to the wiles of imperialism. But I suggest that some of the stratagems and the operational methods of imperialism have changed.

High on the list of imperialism's major weapons today are dis-information and destabilisation. In relation to destabilisation and dis-information I would like to quote two very important sections of the declaration on the inadmissibility of intervention and interference in the internal affairs of states, to which reference was made by Cde. Shahabuddeen:

The duty of a state to refrain from any action or attempt in whatever form under whatever pretext to destabilise or to undermine the stability of another state or any of its institutions."

Equally, I would like to put on record this provision of that declaration:

"The duty of the state to refrain from the exploitation and the distortion of human rights issues as a means of interference in internal affairs of states, of exerting pressure on other states or creating distrust and disorder within and among states or group of states."

Destabilisation is one of the weapons of imperialism for ensuring that the countries in this hemisphere and beyond are required to behave in a manner that would be liked by the United States.

Be that as it may, Cde. Speaker, we need to take note that at this time the techniques of imperialism involve destabilisation, and dis-information including dissemblance; and I think we need to look as well at the way how these are combined with the so-called campaign for human rights and democracy."

Cde. Speaker, the clear objective of the action that was undertaken on the morning of October 25, was to sanitize Grenada and to send a clear warning, an unmistakable signal, to socialist and other progressive countries and forces in the Caribbean and in Central America. It is a clear signal, because as the Cde. President has described to the nation, as he described to the people of Guyana at the rally, when the Caricom leaders met in Port-of-Spain on the 22nd and 23rd of October, there was on the morning of the 23rd at 3:06 a.m. a consensus which would have provided a non-military alternative for dealing with the situation in Grenada on the basis of a Caricom and only a Caricom response."

Cde. Speaker, I think this National Assembly will feel pleased to know that when we decided to conclude the debate last night, well over 70 countries had spoken in the Security Council and of those 70, only the invaders, the aggressors, supported their own action. Similarly Cde. Speaker, we found that in the OAS there was a complete isolation of the aggressors; and from the Non-Aligned Movement, which is meeting today, I am confident that there will be a similar expression of condemnation.

The nature of the international response therefore needs no description. The Cde. Prime Minister has given an indication of this and the Cde. Minority Leader also dealt with this question; but I think that we should take note that even within the United States itself, in the home of the principal aggressor, there is great unease, great questioning, and great condemnation. Today I understand the House of Representatives Foreign Affairs Sub-Committee adopted a resolution with 32 votes in favour and 2 against, calling for the withdrawal of American troops within a specified time. I think this is a good sign and I think we need, through all our contacts, both at the level of party and at the level of government, to try to mobilise groups within the United States to oppose these dastardly policies."



A concentration camp in Hitler's and Pinochet's style.

**PRESS STATEMENT ISSUED BY THE CENTRAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
PEOPLE'S NATIONAL CONGRESS**

The Central Executive Committee of the People's National Congress views with horror the military invasion of Grenada by armed forces of the United States of America which are now engaged in fierce battle with the valiant Grenadian people defending their homeland and their revolution.

The recent events which led to the unfortunate crisis within the New Jewel Movement and the country cannot be used as an excuse for trampling national sovereignty and territorial integrity of any country no matter how small it may be.

We deeply regret the action of some countries within the region which support this invasion and are physically associated with it. The People's National Congress is concerned that such action can become a precedent and can be used against other Caricom countries. Equally we are happy to note that there has been disassociation by other countries in the region from this act of aggression. Today's events are inexcusable.

We hope that there is still time for the United States to appreciate that invasion will not return peace to Grenada and can in no way contribute to development and true stability to our Region.

We call on all peace-loving people, parties and groups throughout the world especially in the United States of America to raise their voices in condemnation of the bellicose behaviour of the Imperialist circles in the United States so that respect can return to a nation which itself has known the trauma of the revolution and civil war and the misery entailed.

The Central Executive Committee of the People's National Congress on behalf of the people of Guyana, demand an immediate withdrawal of the invading troops and the re-establishment of an atmosphere of peace and calm to a sister Caribbean Nation. Let dawn break on a sovereign Grenada.

Once again, our sympathy goes out to the people of Grenada and our pledge of Solidarity for the maintenance of National Sovereignty.

1983-10-26

RESOLUTION PASSED AT MASS RALLY

WHEREAS this mass assembly of Guyanese and other friends from all walks of life, and of differing political, religious and cultural persuasions gathered here at the Conference Centre, Sophia on this day of October 27, 1983, to express our solidarity with our valiant and heroic brothers and sisters of Grenada whose country has been invaded by troops of the United States of America, the Organisation of Eastern Caribbean States, Jamaica and Barbados.

AND WHEREAS this brutal invasion constitutes:

- (i) A contravention of the Articles of the Principles and Policies of Non-Alignment to which most of the countries of the Organisation of Eastern Caribbean States, Jamaica and Barbados subscribe;
- (ii) A breach of the inviolable principles of international law;
- (iii) A violation of the Conventions of the United Nations Charter; and
- (iv) An arrogant disregard of the 1981 United Nations Declaration of the Inadmissibility of Interference and Intervention in the Internal Affairs of States.

AND WHEREAS the action of the United States of America and its supporters:

- (i) Reintroduces into the Latin America and Caribbean Region a new era of colonialism and imperialism;
- (ii) places at risk the invasion of any country in the Region whose policies, at any given time, should find disfavour with the United States of America;
- (iii) prejudices the efforts of the Contadora Group of countries — Venezuela, Colombia, Panama and Mexico to dissuade intervention and interference by countries outside the Region and so promote the conditions necessary for peace and stability in the Region;

AND WHEREAS the heroic and valiant efforts of the Grenadian people are clearly demonstrated:

- (i) By resisting this imperialist invasion;
- (ii) and in continuing to defend their homeland despite the sophisticated weapons of the aggressors.

BE IT RESOLVED that this mass rally expresses its solidarity and support for the struggling people of Free Grenada and the heroic Cuban workers many of whom have lost their lives in repelling the US/OECS invasion:

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this mass assembly of Guyanese and other friends call upon members of the United Nations, the Non-Aligned Movement and all peace loving peoples to severally and jointly condemn the military aggression of the United States of America and demand:

- (i) the immediate withdrawal of all foreign troops from Grenadian soil;
- (ii) the establishment of a fact-finding mission of eminent Caribbean personalities to go to Grenada;
- (iii) adequate reparation for the Grenadian people for the wanton death and destruction caused by their forces;

- (iv) and that their Government unequivocally declare their solidarity with the Grenadian people on their gallant struggle to maintain their national sovereignty and territorial integrity.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this mass assembly convey its profoundest admiration and respect to the Cuban Party and Government for their efforts in assisting to defend the sovereignty of Grenada.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT:

- (i) Guyana continues to mobilise internal and external support and assistance for the embattled Grenadian people.

Moved by: Walter Bipat

Seconded by: Khemraj Lochan

October 27, 1983



The U.S. "Stars and Stripes" flutters from a tank rumbling up a peaceful hillside.

EXCERPTS OF A PRESS RELEASE BY THE GUYANA TRADES UNION CONGRESS

The Executive Council of the Guyana Trades Union Congress at a meeting held on **Wednesday 26th October, 1983** authorised the following release in connection with the Grenada situation

EXCERPTS:

The Executive Council of the TUC deeply regretted that the political leaders and the People's Revolutionary Government of Grenada had not been successful in their efforts to resolve their disagreements and as a consequence the very sad developments took place in which a number of Grenadians including the Prime Minister Maurice Bishop and some of his Ministers lost their lives through the use of guns.

The situation which had emerged in Grenada as a result of these sad developments was indeed very serious and called for the collaboration of all Caribbean Governments in the search for a solution. It was for this purpose that the Caribbean Heads of Governments met in Port-of-Spain over the last weekend.

Again the TUC must express its deep regret that the Caricom Heads of Government at the meeting did not remain steadfast to the consensus which had been reportedly reached at one stage of the meeting as to the means by which the situation should have been approached.

Instead the meeting ended in sharp division and disagreement on an occasion when the opportunity should have been exploited to project Caricom as an effective and indispensable mechanism for the promotion of Caribbean Unity.

The TUC considered it a matter for deep regret that immediately following the breakdown at the Caricom Heads of Government meeting, through what appeared to be a calculated action by some Heads of Government at the meeting, six Caribbean Governments displayed gross misjudgement of the grave implications of their action in not only requesting the United States Government to spearhead the military invasion of Grenada, but also by facilitating the United States Government's compliance with their request through the involvement of their nationals as part of the United States invasion force.

What in fact these six Caribbean Governments have done perhaps in the mistaken belief that the invasion of Grenada would ensure their own territorial security, was to provide the United States with a pretext and the opportunity for which it had been going after for some time to display its military might in the region as a warning intended to intimidate the people of the region including those of the six countries concerned against the exercise of their fundamental right to conduct the affairs of their countries as Sovereign States in accordance with what they believe to be their best interest.

Grenada's territorial integrity has been violated by the United States and the six Caribbean countries involved without the least bit of justification. Up to now no satisfactory explanation has been forthcoming from any of the Caribbean Governments for their involvement in invading a sister Caribbean nation led by the United States.

It must have been a frustrating experience for those Caricom Heads of Government at the meeting last weekend who held out in principle against military intervention in Grenada

and instead sought to convince their colleagues about the wisdom of working towards a peaceful solution of the situation. Caricom nevertheless must not be allowed to become endangered by this experience.

The Guyana TUC calls on all workers in Guyana to demonstrate solidarity with the workers and people of Grenada and to offer them all possible support.

The TUC strongly condemns the United States for its calculated aggression against the people of Grenada by its invasion of the country regardless of the fact that it was requested by the six Caribbean Governments to undertake the invasion. It demands the immediate withdrawal of all foreign troops from Grenada.

Caribbean trade union unity can and must be made to play a very important role in overcoming the situation in Grenada.

In the interest of Caribbean trade union unity, also in the interest of all Caribbean people, all workers in the Caribbean must unite their efforts to bring an end to the Grenada situation as early as possible.

GUYANA TRADES UNION CONGRESS
CRITCHLOW LABOUR COLLEGE
NON PARIEL PARK, GEORGETOWN

J.H. POLLYDORE
GENERAL SECRETARY
OCTOBER 27, 1983



A damaged Fort Rupert, "victim" of the U.S. bombing.



A United States Marine stands triumphantly on Grenadian soil, the Stars and Stripes symbolising aggression and possession.

THE (DIS-) INFORMATION STRATEGY

The following three pieces indicate how an effective policy was quickly implemented to blunt the use of the free media to expose the lies and half-truths inherent in the U.S. invasion of Grenada.

The immediate post-invasion period was a case study of the manipulation of the (so-called 'free') media to suit the purposes of various interest-groups. The power of the media was doubtlessly appreciated by the U.S. military and by certain Caribbean interest-groups who, knowingly or unwittingly, aided and abetted a "mis-information and dis-information" offensive. The following are the three (3) pieces:

6(A):

THE REGIONAL MEDIA AND THE GRENADA TRAGEDY

(Viewpoint: by A.A. Fenty — Wednesday 26th October, 1983)
on the Guyana Broadcasting Corporation)

I was of the mind NOT to comment on the Grenada tragedy as I agree that one should always be aware of, and ascertain the facts before forming opinions or viewpoints.

Nevertheless, I wish to use the current travails of our sister CARICOM territory to highlight the role of the media, especially the regional media, when an event such as this one takes place. Mind you, the limited time just will not permit any attempt at in-depth analysis of the media's approach to Grenada since the first major announcement on Friday, October fourteenth.

First and foremost, the importance of an alert, accurate and responsible media was immediately underscored. People of the region yearned for news — accurate news of events as they kept unfolding after October 14. Of course, in such a volatile situation, one of the first acts of the military, in the days just after Day One, was to cut off as many of the telecommunications links with the outside world as it could. Accurate news from St. Georges, then became even more of a precious commodity. Senders, sources and messages became much more sought after. Guyanese, living in what is still obviously an open information society, tuned into our own GBC or monitored Radio Free Grenada, C.B.C. Radio 900 in Barbados, the BBC and Voice of America to catch the facts — and various versions of those facts. Other sources or senders of news included media workers who managed to stay in Grenada, especially those attached to regional and International news agencies, officials attached to embassies, people working with international bodies in Grenada, Grenadians who still managed to send messages out and of course, the ruling Military Council, which had commandeered the Island's Radio Station. Channels of communication like the telephone and telex were seen for the important tools of society which they are.

But let's focus briefly on how they were used. The new rulers in Grenada naturally used their radio, and individuals friendly to them, to tell their side of the story. Organs of the regional media institutions could not help reflecting the views of respective administrations. Those in three Caricom more Developed Countries (M.D.C's) — Jamaica, Barbados and Trinidad — make good, albeit unfortunate — reference points. The views of political leaders were publicised and given full rein. Moral judgements, personal view-points predominated amongst conflicting reports from St. George's, after Comrade Bishop's death. As local commentator Clem David pointed out last week, media people had the Devil's job, getting factual, up-to-date news out of Grenada, even as one Barbados newspaper had time to publicise details about the late Prime Minister's insurance policies.

Then there was the treatment in certain regional print media during the pre-invasion weekend. One Guyanese correspondent had to remark on the vitriolic editorials in Trinidad's weekend newspapers

which merely helped to fan the flames of emotionalism which precipitated yesterday's invasion and which, incidentally, call into question the status of some of our Caribbean leaders.

Instructive too, was the treatment by Barbados' CBC 900 on Day One of the invasion, yesterday. Apparently, the American component of the so-called Multinational Peace Keeping "Friendly Forces" set up a powerful radio transmitting facility to get their messages across. (Proof of the power of the media and communication again!) Barbados CBC then spent most of the morning monitoring the invading forces radio for updates on the situation as the invaders wanted it known. (Granted, that the Barbados radio-station did a good job in its constant, all day monitoring.) Their theme "More than a station — the heart and soul of the nation" covering the Grenada situation, is as catchy as the selected calypsoes and reggae played for the whole day yesterday. Even those songs by Short-Shirt, Marley and Sparrow reflected the thinking of the Radio Station people (and perhaps their Administration!) One sometimes even detected an air or feeling of celebration as the C.B.C. announcers interspersed their monitoring with obviously specially-selected music.

Later yesterday afternoon listeners even heard much, from the relatively unknown "Grenada Democratic Movement", an aspiring group to power-sharing there.

Well, all I've attempted to do, is to indicate, if really it was necessary, the role and influence of the media in situations such as these. I wonder whether Caribbean Broadcasting Union (CBU) has any views on the matter?

A.A. Fenty.

6(B): GRENADA: PROTESTS CONTINUE ABOUT PRESS RESTRICTION, MISLEADING INFORMATION

St George's: 83-11-21 (Associated Press) — Protests that began over Press restrictions during the US-led invasion of Grenada continue during the occupation with American and other reporters complaining about unreliable information and unfair treatment.

Much of the criticism has been laid squarely on US military and Government Officials here.

Members of a Resident Press Corps numbering up to 125 and covering the invasion's aftermath have been frustrated by problems ranging from conflicting body counts and inaccessability of top US and Grenadian officials to the unreliable telephone and telex services.

Reporters in residence in Grenada were particularly angered this week when the US Government flew in a group of eight foreign newsmen stationed in Washington and provided them with conducted tours, comfortable lodgings and two days of detailed briefings from US Ambassador Charles Gillespie and Major General John Farris, Commander of the US Combat troops.

Journalists in St George's "would have been welcome to the briefings", said spokesman Jim Dandridge of the US Mission in Grenada. But he quickly admitted that they had not been invited or even informed that the briefings were taking place.

Two reporters, who tried to attend one of the lengthy briefing sessions for the visiting group were told that the meeting was "closed to you guys".

This led to allegations that the United States was going out of its way to convince other countries — through the foreign reporters based in Washington — that the intervention in Grenada was necessary and inevitable.

Several correspondents based in Grenada contended throughout the week that Dandridge and the US Military spokesman, Major Douglas Frey, had intentionally misled the Press about the number of killed and wounded Cubans and Grenadians.

In an angry exchange between reporters and Dandridge yesterday, the Spokesman for the US Mission said, "I take offence to the charge that the State Department or any other agency of the US Government has lied to the Press."

"It has been our interest to give you as much, as accurate information . . . as we can stand on".

Major Frey said, "We try to give you what we can get."

Dandridge maintained throughout the week that the number of bodies of Cubans killed in action and shipped to Havana was 42. But Frey said on Friday that although the Cuban Charge D'Affairs and the International Red Cross agreed to the total of 42. "We shipped 41."

He gave no explanation for this, further complicating the official count of Cuban dead.

Officials in Havana said earlier in the week that only 24 Cuban soldiers had been killed fighting US-Caribbean Forces. Later, they said they had returned 13 non-Cuban bodies to Grenada, leaving five bodies unaccounted for.

Dandridge told reporters in his briefing yesterday, however, that Cuba had sent 15 bodies in 13 bags. The question of the three to five missing bodies was still unresolved this weekend.

"AN OFF-THE RECORD WAR"

(Article from NEWSWEEK Magazine, U.S. Edition, November 7, 1983)

THE PENTAGON'S RESTRICTIONS PROVE A POWERFUL WEAPON IN THE CAMPAIGN FOR PUBLIC SUPPORT OF THE INVASION

When the press filed its first reports on last week's invasion, one thing in particular was missing: a **Grenada dateline**. Doubtless encouraged by Britain's successful news restrictions during the Falklands war, the US military indulged an old dislike of journalists and for two long days banned any authorised visits to the island. When the press finally was allowed in, it was only in small "pool" groups under tight escort and for short periods — a restriction that promised to last into this week. And frustrating as the situation was for the hundreds of journalists assembled on Barbados, it had even more serious implications for Americans at home who sought answers to troubling questions about the intensity of the fighting and the length of the U.S. commitment in Grenada.

The problem began this week as a **credibility crisis**. Following **HINTS OF AN IMPENDING INVASION** (NEWSWEEK, Oct. 31), several reporters asked White House Press spokesmen about the rumours and were flatly told: "**preposterous.**" (The sides claim they were misled by the Deputy Director of the National Security Council, Rear Admiral John Poindexter.) The deception **angered** reporters — and damaged White House credibility — **but most could sympathize with the military's desire for surprise.**

They could not, however, willingly accept exclusion from the battlefield, especially after one Pentagon spokesman boasted that "we learned a lesson from the British." As journalists quickly pointed out, Britain did permit correspondents on their ships and did allow them to land on the Falklands alongside the troops, although their dispatches were heavily censored. And that is an important distinction: as Howard Simons, Managing Editor of The Washington Post, puts it:

"If somebody had come to me and said, 'you can't report this until the operation is secure,' I would have said, 'Fine.' (But) I want to be there, I want to see it with my eyes, not the Pentagon's."

The only foreign correspondents present during the first day of the invasion were a group of seven who flew from Barbados to Union Island on Monday and then chartered a boat, finally reaching Grenada around 12.30 Tuesday afternoon — some seven hours after the military action began. After American authorities implied they would probably be able to use naval radio facilities to file their stories, three of the reporters took a helicopter to the USS Guam. Once on board, however, they were not allowed to send any messages — the available channels were said to be too clogged with urgent military communications. Not until Thursday were they able to file dispatches, for Friday editions.

Meanwhile, the harassment was continuing. American patrol boats and low-flying planes warned press-hired craft away from Grenada. The pilot of a commercial plane landing in Barbados told American photographers on board not to shoot pictures of the military transports below. A photographer who did get pictures of sleeping troops in Barbados had his film seized by an American Navy Commander. And ham radio operators in America received pointed reminders from the Federal Communications Commission about rules against letting news organization use their frequencies to conduct interviews.

Even without active discouragement, the logistics of filing were difficult. Among them, the journalists had about a dozen telephones at a makeshift Press Centre. The only sanctioned access to Grenada was for "pool" members — initially limited to representatives of "national" news media like the television networks, the news magazines and two or three daily papers. Even then, coverage was restricted to areas the military would let them see. Only a handful of reporters and photographers, including three from NEWSWEEK, managed to slip into Grenada by other means to obtain independent reports.

The immediate gain for the administration was the absence of any bloody footage of the Grenada invasion on American television screens. Instead of live action, the networks were reduced to elaborate graphics, sometimes accompanied by a crackling voice — over recorded by a ham radio operator. The first Grenada-related pictures with people in them were just what the Administration wanted: grateful students evacuated from St George's University School of Medicine, kissing the ground when they reached America. Then came the first film from the island itself: taken, and censored, by the military.

The administration argued that it was keeping the press out to protect the lives of journalists, but reporters were quick to point out that they had never held the government responsible for their safety during any other conflict. Reporters "are ready once again to risk their lives just as our troops are doing," National News Council President Richard S. Salant said in a telegram to the President. One frequently repeated Administration argument was what The New York Times called the "I'm-just-a-civilian" ploy: Defence Secretary Caspar Weinberger's assertion that since military commanders didn't want reporters along, civilian chiefs "wouldn't ever dream" of over-riding their decision.

The trouble is that the Generals who now run the Pentagon were Colonels in Vietnam and blame the press in large part for losing the war. In the end, the Administration's treatment of the press in Grenada seems to reflect a larger view about freedom of information: as he has repeatedly shown, this President doesn't believe in it.



Grenadian citizens taken "prisoner" by US Marines backed by their heavy artillery.